

REMARKS

By this Amendment the specification has been amended on page 4 to remove the words "a generally cylindrical" which the examiner has object to, claims 5 and 6 have been amended to comply with U.S. patent practice, and claim 7 has been canceled. Entry is requested.

In the outstanding final Office Action the examiner has objected to claims 1-6 because of the words "the frictional heat" should be "frictional heat" (claim 1, line 6) and "the connection" should be "a connection" (claim 3, line 2).

The examiner should note that claim 1 was amended in this regard in the Amendment of October 25, 2005, and claim 3 was revised to delete the words "the connection."

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 2 and 9¹ under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jansen in view of Pfann et al., and he has stated that claims 3-6 contain allowable subject matter.

The applicants thank the examiner for his indication of allowable subject matter; however, they continue to believe and assert that the examiner's combination of Jensen and Pfann et al. to reject claim 1 is not reasonable.

As noted previously, Jensen discloses a linear actuator which includes a braking spring 20 around a cylindrical element 28 of a worm

¹ Should be claims 1, 2 and 7.

wheel and into which a cylindrical piece 32 at the end of a spindle 6 extends. There is no metal insert inside the cylindrical element 28 to remove heat.

Pfann et al. disclose a combined electric motor and brake wherein the electric motor includes a metallic end shield 4 through which the shaft 5 of the motor extends and around which the brake is positioned (on the outer side of the end shield), the brake including a rotor 20 having an annular friction sheet 6, a magnet 17 with a coil 11 and spring 12. The end shield 4 has an annular face in contact with the friction sheet to transfer away heat generated at the friction sheet 6 during braking. The friction sheet 6 is annular, not cylindrical, and the end shield 4 is not positioned inside of the friction sheet.

The examiner continues to assert that, based on the use of the heat conveying end shield 4 in Pfann et al., it would be obvious to include a metallic insert in the cylindrical element 28 of Jensen. However, this assertion is simply not reasonable as the end shield 4 in Pfann et al., which has an annular face in contact with the annular friction sheet 4, is not suggestive of an element (e.g., cylindrical) inside of the cylindrical element 28 of Jensen.²

² The essence of these comments were conveyed to the examiner during a telephone call on May 15, 2006.

The prior art rejection against claims 1, 2 and 7 should be withdrawn and all the claims allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC

By:



Richard H. Tushin

Registration No. 27,297

Franklin Square, Third Floor West

1300 I Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20005-3353

(202) 906-8680